



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 08/825,400 | 03/28/97 | MURATA | 040679/6439 |

FOLEY & LARDNER
3000 K STREET NW SUITE 500
PO BOX 25696
WASHINGTON DC 20007-2696

MM71/0119

| EXAMINER |
|----------|
|----------|

CUNEO, K

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2831

DATE MAILED: 01/19/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/825,400

Applicant(s)
Haruhiko Murata et al.

Examiner
Kamand Cuneo

Group Art Unit
2831



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Kamand Cuneo (3) _____
(2) Mr. Johnny Kumar (4) _____

Date of Interview Jan 14, 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Degani et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant suggested to change "solder bumps" to "solder balls." Actual determination cannot be made until the final form of the claims are reviewed, but this change appears to overcome the Degani et al. reference considering elements (36). Applicant also inquired whether the addition of "reflowed" will overcome the Degani et al. reference. This will require thorough consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Kristine Kincaid
Kristine Kincaid
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.